

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT WINCHESTER

TERRY PERRY,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Nos. 4:13-CR-20-HSM-SKL-1
	)	4:16-CV-81-HSM
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before the Court is Petitioner's pro se motion to vacate, set aside, or correct his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 [Doc. 29]. The petition relies on *Johnson v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015), in which the Supreme Court held that the residual clause of the Armed Career Criminal Act (ACCA), 18 U.S.C. § 924(e), was unconstitutionally vague [*Id.*]. The United States responded in opposition to collateral relief on August 1, 2016 [Doc. 31]. Petitioner did not reply and the time for doing so has lapsed. E.D. Tenn. L.R. 7.1, 7.2. For the reasons below, the petition [Doc. 29] will be **DENIED** as untimely and **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

**I. BACKGROUND**

In 2013, Petitioner pled guilty to possessing a firearm as a felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) [Doc. 17]. Based on two prior Tennessee second-degree burglary convictions [Presentence Investigation Report (PSR) ¶¶ 26–27], eight prior Tennessee Class D burglary convictions [*Id.* ¶ 30], a prior Florida burglary-of-a-structure conviction [*Id.* at ¶ 29], and a prior Florida burglary-of-a-dwelling conviction [*Id.*], the United States Probation Office deemed Petitioner to be an armed career criminal under the Armed Career Criminal Act (ACCA), 18

U.S.C. § 924(e), and, in accordance with that designation, sentenced Petitioner to 180 months' incarceration followed by five years' supervised release [Doc. 27]. No direct appeal was taken.

Only July 5, 2016, Petitioner filed the instant § 2255 motion in which he seeks vacatur or correction of his sentence in light of the *Johnson* decision [Doc. 29].

## **II. TIMELINESS OF PETITION**

Section 2255(f) places a one-year statute of limitations on all petitions for collateral relief under § 2255 running from either: (1) the date on which the judgment of conviction becomes final; (2) the date on which the impediment to making a motion created by governmental action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the movant was prevented from making a motion by such governmental action; (3) the date on which the right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if that right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or (4) the date on which the facts supporting the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence. 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f). This same provision governs the timeliness of later-filed amendments. *Cameron v. United States*, No. 1:05-cv-264, 2012 WL 1150490, at \*3–6 (E.D. Tenn. April 5, 2012) (citing *Olsen v. United States*, 27 F. App'x 566 (6th Cir. Dec. 14, 2001)). Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that subsections (f)(2) or (f)(4) apply to his case. Specifically, he has not established that any illegal action by the government prevented him from making the timely petition or the existence of facts affecting his case that could not have previously been discovered through the exercise of due diligence. The timeliness of his petition depends on whether its submission complied with subsections (f)(1) and (f)(3).

For purposes of the subsection (f)(1)—where the statutory period expires one year from the date on which the judgment of conviction becomes final—“a conviction becomes final at the

conclusion of direct review.” *Brown v. United States*, 20 F. App’x 373, 374 (6th Cir. 2001) (quoting *Johnson v. United States*, 246 F.3d 655, 657 (6th Cir. 2001)). “[W]hen a federal criminal defendant does not appeal to the court of appeals, the [direct review concludes] upon expiration of the period in which the defendant could have appealed to [such court], even when no notice of appeal was filed.” *Johnson v. United States*, 457 F. App’x 462, 465 (6th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Sanchez-Castellano v. United States*, 358 F.3d 424, 427 (6th Cir. 2004)). Petitioner’s judgment of conviction became final on April 2, 2014, fourteen days after the Court entered judgment on March 19, 2014. *See Sanchez Castellano v. United States*, 358 F.3d 424, 428 (6th Cir. 2004) (explaining unappealed judgments of conviction becomes final when the period for filing a direct appeal has elapsed); Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(1)(A) (20012) (noting criminal defendant was required to file a notice of appeal within fourteen days of entry of the judgment appealed). The window relief under subsection (f)(1) began to run on that date, expired on April 2, 2015.

The petition contains a singular ground for relief, arguing the *Johnson* decision removed an unspecified number of his prior convictions from the definition of “crime of violence” under § 924(e)(2) and, as a result, requests vacatur of his 180-month sentence [Doc. 29].

Failure to file the instant petition until July 5, 2016—a year after expiration of subsection (f)(1)’s one-year window on April 2, 2015—means that the instant motion is untimely under subsection (f)(1). To the extent that Petitioner relies subsection (f)(3)’s independent filing period for relief based on a newly-recognized right made retroactively applicable on collateral review, the Court notes that the provision’s one-year window runs from the date that the asserted right was recognized by the Supreme Court. 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f)(3). For purposes of the instant case, the new right on which Petitioner relies was first recognized in the *Johnson* decision, which Supreme Court issued on June 26, 2015. *Johnson*, 135 S. Ct. at 2551. Thus, the statutory

window for requesting relief based upon that decision under subsection (f)(3) expired one year later—on June 26, 2016. *See Welch v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 1257, 1265 (2016) (“*Johnson* is . . . a substantive decision and so has retroactive effect . . . in cases on collateral review.”); *In re Windy Watkins*, 810 F.3d 375, 380–81 (6th Cir. 2015) (finding *Johnson* constitutes a new substantive rule of constitutional law made retroactively applicable on collateral review and thus triggers § 2255(h)(2)’s requirement for certification of a second or successive petition). Failure to submit the petition prior to June 26, 2016, makes the filing untimely under subsection (f)(3).

Section 2255(f)’s statute of limitations is not jurisdictional and may be tolled under limited, extraordinary circumstances. *Dunlap v. United States*, 250 F.3d 101, 1007 (6th Cir. 2001). Used sparingly, a petitioner bears the burden of establishing that equitable tolling applies to his case, *see Jurado v. Burt*, 337 F.3d 638, 642 (6th Cir. 2003); *Allen v. Yukins*, 366 F.3d 396, 401 (6th Cir. 2004), and must show “(1) that he has been pursuing his rights diligently, and (2) that some extraordinary circumstance stood in his way and prevented timely filing,” *Holland v. Florida*, 130 S. Ct. 2549, 2562 (2010); *Hail v. Warden*, 662 F.3d 745, 750 (6th Cir. 2011); *see also Jurado*, 337 F.3d at 643 (“Absent compelling equitable considerations, a court should not extend limitations by even a single day.”).

After review of the petition, the Court concludes that Petitioner has failed to put forth a single extraordinary circumstance justifying the failure to submit his collateral challenge within the window permitted by § 2255(f). *Compare Stovall v. United States*, No. 1:12-cv-377, 2013 WL 392467, at \*3 (E.D.T.N. Jan. 31, 2013) (rejecting request for equitable tolling of subsection (f)(1) in absence of evidence illustrating a diligent pursuit of the rights asserted); *with Jones v. United States*, 689 F.3d 621, 627 (6th Cir. 2012) (granting request for equitable tolling where the

petitioner pled facts indicating he had been separated from his legal materials for an extended period of time due to multiple detention transfers and an illness). The petition will be **DENIED**.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

For the reasons discussed, the petition [Doc. 29] will be **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. The Court will **CERTIFY** any appeal from this action would not be taken in good faith and would be totally frivolous. Therefore, this Court will **DENY** Petitioner leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal. See Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. Petitioner having failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, a certificate of appealability **SHALL NOT ISSUE**. 28 U.S.C. § 2253; Rule 22(b) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

**AN APPROPRIATE JUDGMENT ORDER WILL ENTER.**

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.  
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE